

REMARKS

Specification

In the Office Action of February 11, 2008, the Examiner stated that:

The incorporation of essential material in the specification by reference to an unpublished U.S. application, foreign application or patent, or to a publication in improper. Applicant is required to amend the disclosure to include the material incorporated by reference, if the material is relied upon to overcome any objection, rejection, or other requirement imposed by the Office. The amendment must be accompanied by a statement executed by the applicant, or a practitioner representing the applicant, stating that the material being inserted is the material previously incorporated by reference and that the amendment contains no new matter. 37 CFR 1.57(f).

Applicants respectfully submit that the present specification fully supports the claims, and no material incorporated by reference has been relied upon to overcome any objection or rejection. If the Examiner still believes that any material incorporated by reference was relied upon, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to specify such material more particularly.

The Examiner also stated that:

Applicant did not make reference to foreign application 35688/1999 in its specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that priority to Korean patent application 35688/1999 has been properly claimed and a copy of the priority document has been filed at the filing of the present application. Applicants are not aware of any requirement of identifying foreign priority documents in the specification.

Furthermore, the applicants has amended the specification to provide the U.S. patent number of the application referenced on page 7.

Claims

Claims 30-49 and 54-57 were pending when last examined. With this Response, Applicants' have amended claims 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45, 46, 49. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in FIGS. 1-4 and in the corresponding description in the specification. For example, FIG. 1 shows an implementation of the claimed hierarchical data structure, which is further explained in pages 6 and 7.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 30-49, and 54-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20070157225 by Harada et al. ("Harada") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,278,446 to Liou et al. ("Liou"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 30, as amended, recites an apparatus for processing multimedia data. The apparatus includes a memory and a processor configured to perform operations which include receiving segment information about an audio-visual program, generating a hierarchical data structure configured to facilitate browsing content in the audio-visual program, and storing the hierarchical data structure including the segment information and segment group information in the memory. The segment information includes segment location information identifying a plurality of audio-visual segments in the audio-visual program, wherein the segment location information defines each audio-visual segment by a temporal position in a multimedia stream of the audio-visual program and wherein each audio-visual segment represents a continuous temporal content portion in the audio-visual program. The hierarchical data structure includes a first structural part which stores the segment information and a distinct second structural part which stores segment group information defining first and second segment groups for the audio-visual program. Each of the first and second segment groups defines a respective set of non-contiguous audio-visual segments which are selected from the plurality of audio-visual segments and identified in the

segment group information by references to the corresponding segments in the segment information of the audio-visual program. The segment group information specifies a respective group type and a respective duration for each of said first and second segment groups, the respective group types indicating that the first and second segment groups represent respective first and second content summaries related to objects or events as depicted in the audio-visual program. The segment group information also includes segment order information defining that (i) the audio-visual segments within the first segment group are ordered relative to each other according to a time sequence that is significant for the first content summary's representation of the corresponding events or objects in the audio-visual program and (ii) the audio-visual segments within the second segment group are not ordered relative to each other according to any time sequence that is significant for the second content summary's representation of the corresponding events or objects in the audio-visual program.

Harada discloses receiving and displaying coupon information based on user profiles, but lacks several limitations of the claim, as discussed in Applicants' Response to the Office Action dated July 16, 2007, at page 12. In addition, as the Examiner admitted, Harada lacks the claimed hierarchical data structure. The Examiner pointed to Liou for the missing subject matter. Liou, however, is also lacking.

Liou discloses sequential raw video data in which contiguous sections are identified according to a hierarchical scheme. *See, e.g.*, FIG. 12 of Liou. In contrast, the claimed hierarchical data structure includes a first structural part which stores the segment information and a distinct second structural part which stores segment group information defining first and second segment groups. Each of the first and second segment groups defines a respective set of non-contiguous audio-visual segments which are selected from the plurality of audio-visual segments and identified in the segment group information by references to the corresponding segments in the segment information of the audio-visual program. Thus, the claimed hierarchical data structure is not disclosed in Harada and Liou alone or in combination. Accordingly, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established and claim 30 should be allowed.

Furthermore, the Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to combine and modify Harada and Liou to obtain the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree. As the Examiner admitted, Harada lacks any teaching of the claimed hierarchical data structure. Harada also lacks providing first and second segment groups for the same audio-visual program. In addition, Liou's hierarchical grouping includes contiguous sections tied to the time sequence of the video. In contrast, the claimed hierarchical data structure stores the segment information in a first structural part and the segment group information in a distinct second structural part, which uses references to the corresponding segments in the segment information. Thus, the claimed hierarchical data structure provides the flexibility to define, for the same program, different first and second segment groups, which can include non-contiguous segments designated as being ordered or not ordered according to a time sequence. Harada and Liou fail to suggest or otherwise make obvious such a data structure. Accordingly, claim 30 should be allowable.

Claims 31-33 and 54-57 depend from claim 30 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Independent claims 34, 38, 42, and 46 require, in part, limitations that are similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 30. Because Harada and Liou fail to disclose or otherwise render obvious at least these limitations, claims 34, 38, 42, and 46 are allowable. Claims 35-37, 39-41, 43-45 and 47-49 are dependent claims that are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants' respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-7493.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1597.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

7/21/08

Richard A. Fask

Date

Signature

Respectfully submitted,



By:

Ferenc Pazmandi
Agent of Record
Limited Recognition No. L0078
FP/rp

July 21, 2008

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715
(415) 772-1200